DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 080 CS 204 235

AUTHOR Maddox, Lynda; Zanot, Eric J.
TITLE Perceptions of the Advertising Man as Held by Future Practitioners and Their Neighbors.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 51p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (59th, College Park, Maryland, July 31-August 4, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Business Education; College Students; *Credibility; Higher Education; Marketing; Mass Media; Merchandise Information; *Merchandising; *Public Opinion; Public Relations; School Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Advertising; *Advertising Personnel

ABSTRACT

Advertising and the advertising person have long been the subjects of criticism that has been prompted and reinforced by consumerism and mass media. A survey, conducted to determine present attitudes toward the advertising person, involved 70 advertising majors and an equal number of other college undergraduates; all completed questionnaires assigning certain personality traits to advertising persons. Results indicated that the traits most associated with advertising persons are "original" and "creative," and that most of the subjects considered such persons to be bright, energetic, extroverted, trendsetters, and interested in ideas. However, a negative note was indicated by the fact that a large percentage of both groups considered advertising persons to be glib, superficial, aggressive, neurotic, opportunistic, and heavy drinkers. Negative opinions among advertising majors tended to increase with training, reflecting educators' concern that the single most important problem in teaching advertising in the university is the perceived disreputability of the profession. (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED157080

PERCEPTIONS OF THE ADVERTISING MAN

AS HELD BY FUTURE PRACTITIONERS AND THEIR NEIGHBORS

A paper presented to the

Advertising Division

Of the Association for Education in Journalism

1976

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lynda Maddox

Eric J. Zanot

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

by

Lynda Maddox--Special Doctoral Assistant, Southern Illinois University, School of Journalism-Dept. of Advertising, Carbondale, Ill.

&

Eric J. Zanot--Assistant Professor of Advertising, The Pennsylvania State University, School of Journalism--Dept. of Advertising, University Park, Pa.

CS204235

Advertising and the man who works in advertising have long been the subjects of criticism in American society. Advertising is said to promise and then disappoint, to persuade and betray, and to trade public well-being for personal profit; the public is afraid of being brainwashed, manipulated and having its children led astray. It is common to blame the human element in advertising, the man who chooses advertising as a profession, as the supreme ogre.

The mass media have often reinforced this opinion. Movies, plays, novels and tales from admen seem to present a consistently negative image of the advertising executive.

The growing concern with consumerism in America has prompted an especially uncomplimentary view of advertising men. Both Leo Burnett and E.B. Weiss have expressed concern at the effect this may have on talented young people already in the business or on those who may have hoped to make advertising their career choice.[1]

The reality of this image is, probably, of interest to most admen and future admen. Is the advertising man saint or sinner, creative or hard-nosed businessman, satisfied or unsatisfied in his work?

The image of the modern adman has been reflected in books, plays, motion-pictures and television shows. He seems to be most often portrayed as an unethical huckster who is more concerned with his own personal welfare than with anything else. This image has been especially evident in the last ten to fifteen years since the dawn of the "Age of Consumerism."

The number of second-rate novels about the advertising man may be indeterminable. Lest the reader scoff at the uncomplimentary image as being

the exaggerated, sensational work of low-grade novelists, it should be noted that the image is constant throughout the media--in books, plays, motion-pictures and television shows.[2]

While numerous public opinion polls have been conducted to determine the image of advertising, there have been very few that have uncovered the image of the advertising practitioner. This study will examine the existing public opinion surveys on the advertising man and will incorporate pertinent portions of studies on the institution of advertising.

Most of these public opinion studies were, however, conducted immediately following a prosperous decade in American advertising, prior to the rise of our "Ralph Nader America." According to numerous articles in the advertising trade publication, Advertising Age, the rise of consumerism has caused a serious "shakedown" in the advertising business: admen have a poorer mass media image than ever before; there are more admen drop-outs than ever before; and fewer young people are being attracted to advertising as a career.[3]

In order to determine if the adman is perceived negatively among a group of students at The Pennsylvania State University, an opinion survey among advertising majors was conducted.

This study should prove interesting not only to those in the advertising business, but especially to those who educate the future admen. E.B. Weiss, a long-time opinion leader among advertising personnel, expressed concern about the future of advertising in light of a discontent among young people interested in the business:

> ....the image creator has an even poorer public image right now (1970) among more opinion leaders than ever before. Indeed, right now advertising may actually have a less appealing public image with our more intelligent public segments than is true of any other major part of the business community.

> There is little doubt that this is especially true with respect to the more intelligent and better educated--among our younger generations. In this age of youth revolt, that alone spells trouble for the future of advertising in the new society that is evolving.[4]

The advertising man's image will first be examined through public opinion polls conducted by others; then the Pennsylvania State University study will be presented.

Public Opinion Polls About Advertising As An Institution

The first and one of the most massive studies was conducted by Neil H. Borden in conjunction with the Harvard Business School. Respondents reacted to ten economic, social and content statements about advertising; no statements were posed as to the personality or traits of the advertising man. At a time (1930's) when it has been shown that criticism of advertising and the adman was rather high, Borden found surprisingly positive attitudes toward the institution of advertising. Criticism rested largely on the economic instability of the times.[5]

The George Gallup "Studies of Consumer Agitation" conducted in 1939 and 1940 also did not include questions on the adman but centered largely on social and economic effects of advertising. The results of this study seem to paint a much more negative picture of the public view of advertising than Neil Borden's study during virtually the same time period. Eighty-one percent believed advertising sometimes led people to buy things they did not want or could not afford; 49 percent favored compulsory government grade labeling; 64 percent thought there was too great a difference between manufacturing costs and retail costs; 51 percent favored stricter control of advertising content.[6]

Two studies conducted for the Association of National Advertisers in 1942 and 1945 revealed positive attitudes toward advertising in World War II. A large majority found advertising important to the war effort, and 50 percent thought institutional advertising was important during war years.[7]

A study on "Consumer Attitudes Toward Distribution" was undertaken in 1946-1947 by the Committee on Consumer Relations in Advertising. "The attitudes of about 1,600 Americans toward current (1946-1947) advertising and marketing practices, including advertising and its relationship to our economic system, the cost of advertising, information and truth in advertising, and advertising appeals" were investigated.[8] No questions on the adman were included. Results of the study indicated a general support of the economic aspect of advertising, but the public believed it did increase retail prices. Advertising was still considered somewhat misleading, but not as much so as it had been in pre-war polls.[9]

In late 1950 Professor Kenneth Dameron questioned 594 teachers and housewives on the economic and content aspects of advertising. While 41 percent said there was a trend to more truthful advertising, Printer's Ink reported, "Yet it is significant that even in these polls, where advertising is looked upon most favorably by the public, there is a grim undercurrent of criticism."[10] A large majority wanted more information in ads and thought advertising encouraged people to buy things they did not want or could not afford.[11] Thirty-four percent thought advertising was in "bad taste."[12]

Another study of the early 1950's was "conducted by mail with the 1,500 families in the Macfadden Wage Earner Forum panel and distributed through the United States in proportion to wage-earner concentration

(husband's occupation the determinant.)"[13] Bauer and Greyser reported that a favorable view of advertising was indicated by this study; the criticism centered on lack of information in ads, but general economic and social aspects of advertising were rated favorably.[14]

A poll taken in California in 1953 revealed comparable results. Advertising was viewed as generally beneficial to our society, but a majority thought advertising increased prices and caused people to buy things they did not want or could not afford.[15]

A Gallup and Robinson "Mirror of America" study, conducted among housewives in 1958, once again revealed this paradox. While generally favorable in their attitudes toward the economic effects of advertising, the housewives overwhelmingly agreed advertising was somewhat dishonest. Seventy-one percent said advertising was an insult to people's intelligence; however, a surprising 86 percent said we were better off with advertising than without it.[16]

A Gallup Redbook Study conducted in 1959 revealed virtually the same results; however, it also showed conclusively for the first time that the more highly educated had a more negative view of advertising than less well-educated counterparts.[17]

In 1961 a sequel to the Field California Poll of 1953 was undertaken. The study revealed a somewhat less favorable view of advertising in 1961 than in 1953. "More people were opposed to advertising on specific issues than eight years earlier."[18]

Arising from concern of some admen over the image of advertising, the American Association of Advertising Agencies sponsored Hill & Knowlton's Attitude Survey of Opinion Leaders in 1961.[19] Members of the academic com-

munity, business executives, clergymen, editors and government officials were questioned on various social and economic aspects of advertising. While an overwhelming majority found advertising a productive force in the economy, content and lack of information were criticized, and clergymen expressed concern over "advertising's dedication to 'greed and profit'."[20]

Louis Harris and Associates' Study of the Attitudes of Community Leaders Toward the Advertising Industry, conducted in 1962, showed nearly identical results. Economic aspects were generally regarded as positive, while content and lack of information were often held in disregard.[21]

In 1962 the Harvard Business Review studied the attitudes of 2,400 business executives toward advertising.[22] Once again, this group saw advertising as extremely important economically, but they were more negative concerning the social aspects of advertising. Business executives often thought advertising persuaded people to "buy things they should not buy," and they generally agreed standards and quality should be upgraded.[23]

The most recent and the most extensive study of the public's view of advertising was conducted by Raymond A. Bauer and Stephen A. Greyser in 1967. Sponsored by the Harvard Business School and the American Association of Advertising Agencies, this comprehensive nationwide study examined many aspects of the social, economic and informational criticisms of advertising. The study did not, however, examine any criticism or opinions on the admen. Bauer and Greyser, in their summary of overall attitudes of Americans toward advertising, found 41 percent favorable toward advertising in general. The remaining Americans were either mixed, indifferent or unfavorable in their opinions.[24] Bauer and Greyser indicated that they found no decline in advertising's popularity over the 1960's as had been indicated in a British study of the same period.[25] This seems to be in contrast with the Field

California poll which did see a decline in advertising's popularity from 1953 to 1961.[26] Furthermore, it has been noted that in a 1960 study by Universal Marketing Research, 55 percent of the American public was generally favorable towards advertising, in comparison with Bauer and Greyser's 41 percent.[27]

Public Opinion Polls About the Advertising Man

The first (and the only) adman studies concerned primarily with the public image of the adman appeared in the early 1960's. One study, whose dual purpose was to determine the public image of the adman and to see whether that image could be altered by the use of an advertising campaign, was conducted at a midwest university in 1960-1961.[28] Admen were labeled imaginative, creative, opportunistic, Ivy League, aggressive, materialistic, colorful, successful, hard-working, and conformist; they were not considered responsible, honest, intelligent, thoughtful of others, happy, civic minded, or friendly.[29] Thus, while students did associate some positive traits with the advertising executive, there was an obvious negative undertone.

A more positive view of the adman was obtained in 1961 in a "special survey conducted for Broadcasting by The Pulse Inc."[30] The 1,000 people questioned in ten major United States cities were generally favorable towards advertising; they labeled the adman "intelligent/clever," "imaginative/original," "gregarious/extrovert," "ambitious/aggressive," "well-educated/well-informed," "good salesman," and "average." Only a few found him a "showman/actor," "neurotic/nervous," "anxious," "arrogant," or "superficial."[31]

Another study was conducted about the adman in 1961 for Advertising Age. Admen and their non-advertising neighbors were asked in personally conducted interviews about the traits of the adman.[32] In general advertising men were more positive in their assessment of fellow admen than the "neighbors" were.

The "neighbors," representing the public viewpoint, did not consider the adman a solid citizen or honest and straightforward; only a few "neighbors" saw him as responsible.[33] The "neighbors" considered the advertising man as only mildly energetic and bright; however, he was considered original and creative and interested in ideas.[34] He was extroverted, mildly aggressive, glib and superficial, but was considered only mildly irresponsible, clannish and snobbish.[35] However, the public saw the advertising practitioner as overwhelmingly "Ivy League," opportunistic, neurotic and a heavy drinker.[36] No one rated him as the "average man" or considered him dull. It appeared that the "neighbors" would rather have had just about anybody live next to them than an adman.[37]

Advertising people rated themselves as highly interested in ideas, original and creative, extroverted, trendsetters, bright young men or women, energetic and aggressive.[38] They considered themselves glib/superficial, opportunistic, heavy drinkers, Ivy League, Conservative Republicans, irresponsible, and Honest/Straight-forward to a lesser extent than did the "neighbors."[39] Not one adman considered himself to be a solid citizen, an introvert, wishy-washy, an "average man," or dull.[40]

The Study at the Pennsylvania State University

The public opinion studies on the adman were conducted prior to the rise of our "Ralph Nader America." According to many, the rise in consumerism has caused a negative image of advertising and its practitioners; admen have a poorer mass media image than ever before, and there are more admen drop-outs than ever before. This study at the Pennsylvania State University was conducted to determine the image of the adman held by a group of college advertising majors, the admen of tomorrow, and by a group of

their non-advertising major "neighbors."

As a model, the 1961 Market Psychology Inc. study was used; this study was conducted in three suburban areas with a large population of admen. Eighty-five advertising men and eighty of their non-advertising "neighbors" were interviewed. Twenty-four traits were substituted into the following question: "Which industry would someone who is a _____ be most inclined to get into?" (The traits were: solid citizen, honest/straightforward, reliable/responsible, energetic, bright young man/woman, interested in ideas, trendsetter, original and creative, "average man," introvert, extrovert, aggressive, dull, irresponsible, glib/superficial, wishy-washy, clannish, snobbish, Ivy League, opportunistic, neurotic, heavy drinker, liberal Democrat, conservative Republican.) Respondents were asked to assign one of the following six industries to each trait: banking and finance, retail business, advertising, teaching-education, manufacturing, and self-employed professional.

Following the Market Psychology Inc. format, advertising majors and non-advertising majors (their "neighbors") were questioned at The Pennsylvania State University. There were 70 advertising majors who could be reached through advertising classes. By using a large lecture class, it was possible to obtain an equal number of non-advertising majors. Non-advertising majors were asked to sign up for the survey until 70 volunteers were obtained.

Unlike the previous study among admen and their neighbors, this study at The Pennsylvania State University contained questions on specific demographics. Therefore, two different questionnaires were distributed with different questions on demographics for advertising majors and for non-majors; the original personality/trait questions remained the same for each group.[41]

The data was first analyzed on a trait by trait basis in descending

order of frequency of mention by the total sample. To determine possible differences between categories of the demographic sub-groups, (major/non-major, positive/negative view of advertising, etc.), a Chi-square test was used. Tendencies noted throughout the data will be presented; the differences are not statistically significant unless designated as such.

Original and Creative

The trait overwhelmingly associated with the adman by the total sample (ad majors and non-majors) was original and creative. In all categories the percentage rating for original and creative was 50 percent or above. When asked whether they considered advertising a positive or a negative force in American society, even the majority of the thirty-four respondents in the total sample who thought advertising was a negative force considered the advertising man original and creative. There was a statistically significant difference in the response of ad majors versus non-ad majors. Fewer non-majors considered the adman original and creative than majors did (X^2= 7.6136, $p < .05$-- see figure 1). A larger percentage of females than males considered admen original and creative, but this difference was not statistically significant. This tendency was especially evident among non-majors. The sub-group with fewest respondents who considered the adman original and creative was non-majors who held a negative view of advertising; a larger percentage of majors with a negative view of advertising considered the adman original and creative than did non-majors with a negative view. More non-majors who knew an adman or an ad major personally found him original and creative than did those who had no contact with admen. The mass media did not have any specific effect on opinion for the whole sample, but among ad majors, 100 percent of those who said the mass media had not affected their opinion considered the adman original and creative; 70 percent of the ad

majors who said advertising had affected their opinions considered the adman original and creative. Among non-majors, 57.1 percent of those who said the mass media had not affected them found the adman original and creative, and 66.7 percent of those who said the media affected their opinion considered the adman original and creative. Among ad majors, the tendency to rate the adman as original and creative decreased as term standing increased, but no specific tendency was shown for the total sample or for non-majors. Among majors and non-majors, a greater number of journalism and advertising courses taken tended to diminish the feeling that admen were original and creative. The largest percentage of non-majors who found the adman original and creative were business majors, and the smallest percentage were engineers.

Interested in Ideas

Within certain sub-groups, a greater percentage of the respondents considered the adman interested in ideas than original and creative. These included those with a negative view of advertising, those non-majors who did not know admen, and certain term standing sub-groups. The majority of the total sample considered the advertising man interested in ideas. Slightly more non-majors than majors considered the adman interested in ideas. A larger ratio of females tended to be more positive than males in this instance. Knowing an adman personally seemed to have little effect on the opinion of the non-majors. A smaller percentage of non-majors who said the mass media had not affected their opinions considered the adman interested in ideas than did those who had said the media had affected them. As was the case with original and creative, generally as term standing increased, fewer respondents among majors and non-majors ranked the adman as interested in ideas. The number of journalism or advertising courses taken had no obvious effect on opinions, but a higher percentage of majors and non-majors who had

any journalism or advertising courses at all thought the adman interested in ideas than those who had none. The largest percentage of non-majors who rated the adman interested in ideas in Arts and Architecture, while the lowest percentage was in Agriculture and HPER (health, physical education and recreation): however, at least half of those in all the colleges thought the adman was interested in ideas. No statistically significant differences between sub-groups were found for this trait.

Trendsetter

The third trait associated most frequently with the adman by the total sample was trendsetter . Fewer non-majors tended to regard the advertising man as a trendsetter than did the majors or the total sample. In contrast to the previous two traits, a smaller ratio of females were negative in this instance, and very few female non-majors ranked admen as trendsetters. There was a statistically significant difference between those who had a positive view of advertising and those who had a negative view of advertising. Those majors and non-majors with a negative view of advertising did not consider admen trendsetters; even those non-majors with a positive view of advertising did not usually consider the adman a trendsetter; however, majors with a positive view did ($X^2 = 3.794$, $p < .10$--see figure 2). Knowing admen personally seemed to have little or no effect on responses to this trait, and the mass media also had a rather minimal effect. Term standing had no noticeable effect, but the number of journalism and advertising courses among majors did; a larger percentage of advertising majors with two or more journalism courses thought the adman was a trendsetter than did those with fewer courses; a smaller percentage of those with two or more advertising courses thought the adman to be a trendsetter than did those who had fewer than three advertising courses. Among non-majors, those who had journalism courses seemed unaffected,

but proportionately more of those who had no advertising courses found the adman to be a trendsetter than did those who had one. The greatest percentage of respondents who considered the adman a trendsetter were business majors, while the smallest percentage were science majors.

Bright Young Man or Woman

The fourth trait most frequently associated with the adman by the total sample was bright. More majors than non-majors thought the adman was bright. A smaller percentage of females than males considered him bright. Considering the total sample, a positive or negative view of advertising had little effect on the opinion of the respondents; however, a larger proportion of majors with a negative view of advertising considered the adman bright than did those with a positive view, and a larger percentage of non-majors with a positive view of advertising considered the adman bright than those with a negative view did. A lerger ratio of non-majors who did not know an adman personally considered admen in general as being bright than did those who did not know one. There was a statistically significant difference between those who said the media affected their opinion of admen and those who said it did not ($X^2 = 5.5275$, $p < .05$--see Figure 3). More majors who claimed the mass media had no effect on their opinions found the adman to be bright, whereas a greater proportion of non-majors who claimed the mass media had affected them thought the adman was bright. A greater number of journalism courses seemed to result in a more unfavorable opinion of the adman in this instance, but the number of advertising courses had a minimal effect. A greater proportion of non-majors who had either journalism or advertising courses found the adman to be brighter than did those who had none. Term standing had little effect on the total sample or on majors, but as term standing increased a larger

percentage of non-majors thought the adman was bright. The greatest percentage of respondents who considered the adman bright were in liberal arts, and the smallest percentage were in agriculture.

Energetic

The trait next most frequently attributed to the adman by the total sample was energetic. There was a statistically significant difference between the responses of majors and non-majors. Majors mentioned this trait more often than non-majors in reference to the adman ($X^2 = 7.7$, $p < .05$--see figure 4). In general, a smaller percentage of males than females considered the adman energetic. There was a statistically significant difference between those with a positive view of advertising and those with a negative view. A greater proportion of respondents with a negative view of advertising found the adman energetic than did those with a positive view of advertising ($X^2 = 5.3076$, $p < .05$--see figure 5). The mass media had minimal influence on opinions except in the case of non-majors; a smaller proportion of non-majors who claimed the media did not affect their opinions found the adman energetic than did those non-majors who said the media affected their opinions. A larger percentage of non-majors who did not know an adman or major personally thought the adman to be energetic tnan did those who knew an adman or an ad major. Among majors, a larger ratio who had fewer than two courses in advertising thought the adman was energetic than did those who had more advertising courses, but the number of journalism courses had little effect. A smaller percentage of non-majors who had either journalism or advertising courses thought the adman energetic than did those who had no courses in the journalism department. As term standing increased, a smaller proportion of majors thought the adman was energetic than did their lower term counterparts; a generally larger percentage of non-majors felt the adman was energetic

as term standing increased. The largest ratio of non-majors who found the adman to be energetic were science majors, while the smallest percentage were in Arts and Architecture and Human Development.

Extrovert

The sixth trait most frequently associated with the adman by the total sample was extroverted. Once again, more majors than non-majors considered the adman to be an extrovert. A smaller proportion of females than males thought the adman to be an extrovert. There was a statistically significant difference between those who had a positive view of advertising and those who had a negative view of advertising in their response to this question. A smaller percentage of majors who had a negative view of advertising found the adman to be an extrovert than did those who held a positive view of advertising, but among non-majors the difference was minimal ($X^2 = 7.7631$, $p < .01$--see figure 6). In general, among the sub-group that said the media had affected their opinions, a larger proportion found the adman to be an extrovert than did those who said the media had not affected their opinions. A smaller percentage of those who did not know an adman or ad major personally thought admen were extroverts than did those who did not know one. A larger proportion of non-majors who had taken advertising courses thought admen were extroverts than did those non-majors who had not taken any advertising courses, but journalism courses seemed to have little effect on the respondents; among majors, a larger percentage of those who had taken more journalism courses thought the adman was an extrovert than did those who had taken fewer journalism courses, but advertising courses seemed to have little effect. A smaller proportion of advertising majors tend to find the adman an extrovert as term standing increased; non-majors showed a generally opposite trend. The largest percentage of respondents who found the adman to be an extrovert were in agriculture and the smallest were in HPER.

Aggressive

The trait mentioned seventh most frequently by the total sample was aggressive. More majors than non-majors considered the adman to be aggressive, but the difference was not significant. In general, proportionately more females than males found the adman to be aggressive. Among the total sample, a positive or a negative view of advertising did not seem to affect the respondents' opinion on the aggressiveness of the adman; however, a greater proportion of majors with a negative view of advertising considered the adman aggressive than did those non-majors with a positive view of advertising. There was a statistically significant difference in the responses of those who said the mass media affected their opinion and those who said it did not. Of the total sample, a smaller percentage of those who said the mass media did not affect their opinion of the adman found the adman aggressive than did those who said it did; majors agreed with the total sample, but non-majors considered the opposite to be true. ($X^2 = 4.286$, $p < .05$--see figure 7) smaller proportion of non-majors who did not know an adman or ad major personally thought admen, in general, to be more aggressive than did those who knew one. There was a statistically significant difference in opinions of those non-majors who took journalism or advertising courses and those who did not. A greater proportion who had taken either journalism or advertising courses thought the adman to be aggressive than did those non-majors who had taken none ($X^2 = 8.706$, $p < .01$--see figure 8). Among ad majors, the greater the number of journalism courses taken, the more respondents considered the adman aggressive, the greater the number of advertising courses taken, the less the respondents considered him aggressive. Term standing did not seem to have a significant effect on the responses of any group, but among majors a gradual decrease in aggressiveness associated with the adman appeared as term standing increased. The greatest percentage of non-majors who found the adman aggressive were in business. The smallest percentage were in English and education.

Glib/Superficial

Glib/superficial was the eighth trait most frequently associated with the adman by the total sample. A statistically significant difference was noted between the responses of majors and non-majors. More non-majors attributed this trait to the adman than did non-majors ($X^2 = 2.7185$, $p < .10$--see figure 9). Sex did not seem to affect responses except in the case of females who were not advertising majors. A smaller proportion found the adman glib/superficial than did their male counterparts. In all cases, those who had a positive view of advertising considered the adman glib/superficial proportionately less frequently than did those who had a negative view of advertising. Knowing an adman personally had a negligible effect on the response of the non-majors; the mass media had no noticeable effect on the total sample, but a larger percentage of majors who said the media had influenced their opinion of the adman found the advertising man to be glib/superficial than did those who said the media did not affect them, while fewer non-majors who said the media affected them found the adman to be glib/superficial than did those non-majors who said the media had not affected them. The more journalism and advertising courses the majors had taken, the larger percentage of respondents considered the adman to be glib/superficial, while a higher proportion of non-majors who had no journalism or advertising courses found the adman to be glib/superficial than those who had taken such courses. As term standing increased, a larger percentage of the total sample found the adman to be glib/superficial. The highest ratio of respondents who found the adman to be glib/superficial were in agriculture, and the smallest ratio were in education.

Liberal Democrat

The trait ninth most frequently attributed to the adman by the total

sample was liberal democrat; once again, more majors considered the adman a liberal democrat than did non-majors. The sex of the respondents had no effect on their answers. There was a statistically significant difference between opinions of those who had a positive view and those who had a negative view. A greater percentage of majors who had a positive view of advertising considered the adman a liberal democrat than did those who had a negative view, but the opinion of non-majors was unaffected by their view of advertising ($X^2 = 3.074$, $p < .10$--see figure 10). In the total sample and among non-majors, a greater percentage who said the mass media affected their opinion of the adman overwhelmingly found the advertising man a liberal democrat than did those who said the media did not bias them, however among majors the opposite case was true. Over 50 percent of the non-majors who said the media had affected them found the adman to be a liberal democrat; 14.3 percent of non-majors who said the media did not affect them found the adman to be a liberal democrat. Those who knew admen thought the adman was a liberal democrat more often than those who did not know one. The number of courses in either journalism or advertising had relatively little effect on the opinions of the respondents, but a mild tendency indicated the more journalism courses taken, the more the respondent considered the adman a liberal democrat; the more advertising courses taken, the less likely the respondent was to consider the adman a liberal democrat. Non-majors who had either journalism or advertising courses did not think the adman was a liberal democrat as often as those who had none. Term standing did not affect opinions on this question; the greatest proportion of non-majors who found the adman to be a liberal democrat were in arts and architecture, while the smallest proportion were in liberal arts.

Neurotic

The trait tenth most frequently associated with the advertising man by

the total sample was neurotic; a significantly larger number of advertising majors considered the adman neurotic than did non-majors ($X^2 = 10.27$, $p < .001$--see figure 11). Sex had no obvious effects on opinions. There was a statistically significant difference between those who had a positive view of advertising and those who had a negative view of advertising in their responses to this trait. Both majors and non-majors with a positive view of advertising considered the adman neurotic; the largest number of respondents who considered the adman neurotic were ad majors who had a positive view of advertising ($X^2 = 2.9006$, $p < .10$--see figure 12). The mass media effect did not seem to influence opinion except in the case of majors who claimed it did not affect them; a greater percentage found the adman neurotic than did those who said the media did not affect them. Knowing an adman personally also had no noticeable effect on the responses of non-majors. A smaller percentage of non-majors who had taken journalism courses considered the adman neurotic than did those who had taken none; among majors, the more journalism or advertising courses taken, the more the respondents considered the adman neurotic. Term standing had little noticeable effect except among majors where a larger proportion found the adman neurotic as term standing increased; the greatest percentage of non-majors who found the adman neurotic were in engineering; the smallest percentage were in business and agriculture.

Opportunistic

The eleventh trait most frequently associated with the advertising man by the total sample was opportunistic. There was a statistically significant difference between the responses of majors and non-majors. More advertising majors than non-majors considered the adman an opportunist ($X^2 = 4.229$, $p < .05$--see figure 13). A larger proportion of females than males considered the adman

an opportunist. A positive or negative view of advertising did not seem to affect respondents, but knowing an adman personally did; a smaller ratio of non-majors who knew an adman found him an opportunist than did those who did not know one. A larger percentage who said the media had affected their opinions found the adman to be an opportunist than did those who said it did not affect them. A smaller proportion of majors who had taken more journalism courses considered the adman an opportunist than did those who had taken only a few, but a greater percentage who had taken more advertising courses found the adman an opportunist than did those who had taken less. Journalism or advertising courses had a negligible influence on the responses of non-majors. Term standing also did not affect the opinions of non-majors, but as term standing increased among majors, they decreasingly found the advertising opportunistic. The greatest ratio of non-majors who considered the adman opportunistic were in liberal arts, the smallest percentage were in human development, HPER and engineering.

Heavy Drinker

Over 20 percent of the total sample considered the adman a heavy drinker; more ad majors than non-majors thought this trait was attributed to the adman ($X^2 = 8.1$, $p < .001$--see figure 14). In general, a larger percentage of males than females thought the adman was a heavy drinker. There was a significant difference in opinions between those who had a positive view of advertising and those who had a negative view. Those with a negative view considered the adman a heavy drinker more than those with a positive view did ($X^2 = 3.141$, $p < .10$--see figure 15). Knowing an adman personally had little effect on the opinions of non-majors. There was a significant difference in the responses of those who said the media had affected their responses and those who said it did not. Among majors, those who said the media had not affected their

opinion considered the adman a heavy drinker to a greater degree than did those who said the media had affected their opinions, but among non-majors the findings were the opposite ($X^2 = 2.986$, $p < .10$--see figure 16). A larger percentage of non-majors who had taken journalism or advertising courses considered the adman a heavy drinker than did those who had taken none; the more journalism and advertising courses the majors had taken, the more likely they were to consider the advertising man a heavy drinker. As term standing increased, a larger ratio of majors found the adman a heavy drinker, but non-majors saw little difference as term standing increased. The greatest percentage of non-majors who thought the adman was a heavy drinker were in liberal arts, while education, agriculture, HPER and engineering majors did not find the adman a heavy drinker at all.

Irresponsible

The next trait associated with the adman was irresponsible. There was no difference between the responses of majors and non-majors, but a slightly larger percentage of males than females considered the adman irresponsible. A larger ratio of majors with a negative view of the adman found him irresponsible than did those with a positive view, but this made little difference in the responses of non-majors. In general, a larger proportion who said the mass media had not affected their opinion found the advertising man irresponsible than did those who said it had; a higher percentage of non-majors who did not know an adman also found the adman irresponsible than did those who did know one. No non-majors who had taken journalism or advertising courses found the adman irresponsible, but a larger ratio of majors who had taken a greater number of journalism or advertising courses thought the adman was irresponsible than did those who had not taken as many. Term standing had little effect on the responses of non-majors, but a slightly greater percentage of majors considered

the adman irresponsible as term standing increased. The largest percentage of non-majors who found the adman irresponsible were in HPER; no one in education, business, agriculture, human development and arts and architecture did.

Wishy-Washy

The fourteenth trait most frequently associated with the adman by the total sample was wishy-washy. There was a statistically significant difference between the responses of majors and non-majors. More non-majors than majors attributed this trait to the adman ($X^2 = 4.7726$, $p < .05$--see figure 17). A slightly larger proportion of males than females considered the adman wishy-washy. A statistically significant difference was found between the responses of those who had a negative view of advertising and those who had a positive view; among majors, those with a positive view of advertising considered the adman more wishy-washy than those with a negative view did, but among non-majors, the opinions were directly opposite ($X^2 = 3.359$, $p < .10$--see figure 18). A slightly larger ratio of those who knew an adman personally considered him wishy-washy than did those who did not know an adman or ad major. Among both majors and non-majors, a greater percentage of those who said the mass media had affected their opinion found the adman wishy-washy than those who said the media had not affected their opinion did. Among ad majors, term standing had little effect, but among non-majors as term standing increased, a greater percentage of respondents found the adman wishy-washy. Those non-majors who had not taken any journalism or advertising courses found the adman to be wishy-washy more than those who had not taken any journalism or advertising courses, but among ad majors a greater proportion of those with two or fewer journalism courses found the adman wishy-washy than did those with three or

more such courses. The opposite tendency appeared when the number of advertising courses were considered. A higher ratio of engineering majors and science majors considered the adman wishy-washy than did any of the other groups of non-majors.

The remainder of the twenty-four traits were associated with the adman by less than seven percent of the total sample, and in general, demographic differences produced no significant differences or fluctuations in responses. No one considered the adman to be a solid citizen, conservative republican, an average man, or dull.

A large majority of the total sample had a positive view of advertising; more advertising majors had a positive view of admen than non-majors did ($X^2 = 7.5337$, $p < .05$--see figure 19). In response to the question of the desirability of having an adman as a next-door neighbor, or marrying one's sister, most respondents did not want an adman. There was a statistically significant difference between majors and non-majors in response to the question of having an adman as a next-door neighbor. More majors than non-majors wanted an adman neighbor ($X^2 = 4.4648$, $p < .05$--see figure 20). The general trend was the same as for most of the other traits: more admen wanted another adman as a next-door neighbor or to marry their sisters than non-majors did.

Tendencies

Many of the aforementioned findings were based on sub-sample demographic groups that were quite small due to their specific nature; therefore, while they may not be statistically significant, they can be useful in citing certain tendencies.

Two traits were associated with the adman by 50 percent or more of the

total sample -- original and creative and interested in ideas. Non-majors also associated these traits with the adman, but 50 percent of the majors considered the adman not only original and creative and interested in ideas but trendsetter and energetic. One of the most obvious tendencies is that advertising majors tended to be more opinionated about admen than non-majors or the total sample were. In practically all instances the majors associated each trait with the adman to a higher degree than non-majors or the total sample did.

In light of this, it may be more appropriate to review the top five traits mentioned by each group in order to determine each sub-sample's opinion of the adman. In this case, the top five traits associated with the adman by majors and non-majors varied little with the total sample. The one exception was in the case of non-majors who attributed one negative trait to the adman among the top five. Among the total sample and ad majors, the top five traits attributed to the adman were all positive: original and creative, interested in ideas, trendsetter, bright, and energetic; the top five traits the non-majors associated with the adman were original and creative, interested in ideas, trendsetter, bright, and glib/superficial. In other words, non-majors had a slightly more negative opinion of the adman than majors or the total sample did. All groups did seem to agree on what the adman is not: an introvert, a solid citizen, a conservative Republican, an average man, or dull.

Since six professions were used in conducting the survey, theoretically each profession would have scored 16.7 percent on a strictly chance distribution. It appears that using this criterion, the total sample and advertising majors attributed more negative traits to the adman than did non-majors. The total sample and ad majors attributed the following negative traits to the adman: neurotic, heavy drinker, opportunistic, and glib/superficial. The only neg-

ative trait associated with the adman by the non-majors was glib/superficial (using the 16.7 criterion). The positive or neutral traits associated with the adman by all groups were the same--original and creative, interested in ideas, trendsetter, bright, energetic, extrovert, aggressive, and liberal Democrat.

Conclusions

In general, this small-scale study at The Pennsylvania State University indicated the same tendencies as most of the previously conducted public opinion polls on the adman. The results are neither totally positive or totally negative, and therefore they may be used differently by different analysts. Some would view the rank order listing of traits with a positive outlook. In all instances eight of the top ten traits are generally positive. The trait most associated with the adman is original and creative, and most considered him interested in ideas, a trendsetter, bright, energetic, and extroverted. However, the same undertone of negativism appeared to be present at The Pennsylvania State University as was indicated in past public opinion studies. Despite the fact that some positive traits were associated with the adman by The Pennsylvania State University students, there was a grim undercurrent of criticism. A large percentage also considered the adman glib/superficial, neurotic, aggressive, opportunistic and a heavy drinker; these negative opinions often become more obvious as term standing increased especially among ad majors.

This is perhaps the trend that has brought concern to opinion leaders like E.B. Weiss who complained that fewer young people were choosing advertising as a career and to educators who claimed that the single most important problem with teaching advertising in universities today is "general student feeling that advertising is not quite respectable."[42]

Figure 1

	Majors	Non-majors
Yes	60	46
No	10	24

N=140

χ^2=7.6136 df=1, $p < .05$

Figure 2

	Majors	Non-majors
Positive	34	17
Negative	2	5

N=58

$\chi^2 = 3.794$ df=1, $p < .10$

Figure 3

	Majors	Non-Majors
Yes	29	18
No	6	1

N=72

$\chi^2 = 5.5275$ df=1, $p < .05$

Figure 4

	Majors	Non-majors
Yes	35	19
No	35	51

N=140

$\chi^2=7.7$ df=1, $p<.05$

Figure 5

	Majors	Non-majors
Positive	30	11
Negative	6	9

N=56

$\chi^2 = 5.3076$ df=1, $p < .05$

Figure 6

	Majors	Non-majors
Positive	25	15
Negative	1	8

N=49

χ^2=7.7631 df=1, $p < .01$

Figure 7

	Majors	Non-majors
Yes	22	17
No	0	3

N= 36

$\chi^2 = 4.286$ df=1, $p < .05$

Figure 8

	Communications Courses	No Communications Courses
Yes	9	33
No	5	93

N=140

χ^2=8.706 df=1, $p < .01$

Figure 9

	Majors	Non-majors
Yes	17	26
No	53	44

N=140

χ^2=2.7185 df=1, $p < .10$

Figure 10

	Majors	Non-majors
Positive	20	8
Negative	2	4

N=34

χ^2=3.074 df=1, $p < .10$

Figure 11

	Majors	Non-majors
Yes	28	11
No	42	59

N=140

$\chi^2 = 10.27$ df=1, $p < .001$

Figure 12

	Majors	Non-majors
Positive	24	8
Negative	4	5

N=41

$\chi^2 = 2.9006$ df=1, $p < .10$

Figure 13

	Majors	Non-majors
Yes	20	10
No	50	60

N=140

χ^2=4.229 df=1, $p < .05$

Figure 14

	Majors	Non-majors
Yes	22	8
No	48	62

N=140

$\chi^2 = 8.1$ df=1, $p < .001$

Figure 15

	Majors	Non-majors
Positive	16	3
Negative	6	5

N=30

χ^2=3.141 df=1, $p < .10$

Figure 16

	Majors	Non-majors
Yes	17	8
No	7	0

N=32

χ^2=2.986 df=1, p<.10

Figure 17

	Majors	Non-majors
Yes	1	7
No	69	63

N=140

^{2}=4.7726 df=1, p .05

Figure 18

	Majors	Non-majors
Positive	6	4
Negative	0	3

N=13

^{2}=3.359 df=1 p .10

Figure 19

	Majors	Non-majors
Positive	60	46
Negative	10	24

N=140

$\chi^2 = 7.5337$ df=1, $p < .05$

Figure 20

	Majors	Non-majors
Yes	19	9
No	51	61

N=140

$\chi^2 = 4.4628$ df=1, $p < .05$

NOTES

[1]"How Do You Sell Advertising to Today's 'Critical' Youth?," Advertising Age, June 19, 1967, p. 84.

[2]Examples of negative media portrayals include:
The Arrangement--by Elia Kazan: book and motion picture
"Bewitched"--television show-1960's
"Say Darling"--broadway play
The Hucksters--by Frederic Wakeman: book and motion picture

[3]Available data as to the number of The Pennsylvania State University students who chose advertising as a major in the last 10 years indicates that between 1967 and 1971, Advertising showed a 20% decrease in majors, while Journalism showed a 64% increase and Broadcast a 400% increase.

[4]E.B. Weiss, "Ad World's Young Potential Rebels Copping Out," Advertisng Age, Dec. 7, 1970, p. 40.

[5]Neil H. Borden, The Economic Effects of Advertising (Chicago): Richard D. Irwin, 1942), Ch. 26.

[6]Raymond A. Bauer & Stephen A. Greyser, Advertising in America: The Consumer View (Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968), p. 397.

[7]Ibid., P. 399.

[8]Ibid., p. 399.

[9]Ibid., p. 400.

[10]"Thunder on the Right," Printer's Ink, Mar. 7, 1952, p. 54.

[11]Ibid., pp. 54-55.

[12]Bauer and Greyser, op. cit., p. 400.

[13]Ibid., p. 400.

[14]Ibid., p. 400.

[15]Ibid., p. 401.

[16]Ibid., p. 401.

[17]Ibid., p. 402.

[18]Ibid., p. 401.

[19]Ibid., p. 403.

[20]Ibid., p. 404.

[21]Ibid., p. 404.

[22]Ibid., p. 405.

[23]Ibid., p. 405. Also, Stephen A. Greyser, "Businessmen Re Advertising," Harvard Business Review, May-June, 1962, pp. 20+.

[24]Ibid., p. 91.

[25]Ibid., p. 391.

[26]Ibid., p. 401.

[27]Ibid., pp. 402-403.

[28]"Attitudes of College Students Toward Advertising and Advertising Careers," The A.A.A.A. Michigan Council Survey presented to A.A.A.A. Nov. 1, 1962. (Survey conducted 1960-61).

[29]Ibid.

[30]"Advertising's Image a Shiny One," Broadcasting, Apr. 17, 1961, p. 27.

[31]Ibid., p. 29.

[32]"What Kind of Person is an Adman?" AA Probes Ad Practitioners and Their Suburban Neighbors," Advertising Age, Mar. 27, 1961, pp. 87-96 (Study by Market Psychology Inc.)

[33]Ibid., pp. 87-96.

[34]Ibid., p. 88.

[35]Ibid., p. 88.

[36]Ibid., p. 88.

[37]Ibid., p. 88.

[38]Market Psychology Inc. study, op. cit.

[39]Ibid.

[40]Ibid.

[41]In the study at The Pennsylvania State University, both majors and non-majors were asked the following demographic information: major, sex, positive or negative view of advertising, did mass media affect their image of the adman, term standing.

Majors, in particular, were asked how many journalism and advertising courses they have taken.

Non-majors were asked if they had known an adman or ad major personally, if they had taken any journalism and/or advertising courses and for their major college.

[42]The reader may review the past public opinion studies which reveal this trend.

The test conducted at the University of Michigan (see footnote 28) revealed positive attitudes such as imaginative, creative, colorful, successful, hardworking, but also negative attributes like opportunistic, conformist, given to admen by student respondents. Students also considered the adman not responsible, not honest, not intelligent, not thoughtful of others, not happy, not civic minded and not friendly.

SOURCES CONSULTED

Books

Bauer, Raymond A. and Greyser, Stephen A. Advertising in America: The Consumer View. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Borden, Neil H. The Economic Effects of Advertising. Chicago: Richard D. Irvin, 1942.

Kazan, Elia. The Arrangement. New York: Stein and Day, 1967.

Wakeman, Frederic. The Hucksters. New York: Rinehart & Co., 1946.

Journals and Periodicals

"Advertising's Image a Shiny One." Broadcasting, Apr. 17, 1961, p. 27.

Greyser, Stephen. "Businessmen Re Advertising." Harvard Business Review, May-June, 1962, p. 20.

"How do You Sell Advertising to Today's 'Critical' Youth?" Advertising Age, June 19, 1967, p. 84.

"Rumble on Madison Avenue: Attitude of Prominent Americans Toward Advertising." Time, Oct. 20, 1961, p. 83.

Weiss, E.B. "Ad World's Young Potential Rebels Are Copping Out." Advertising Age, Dec. 7, 1970, p. 1.

"What Kind of Person Is an Adman? AA Probes Ad Practitioners and Their Suburban Neighbors." Advertising Age, Mar. 27, 1971, p. 87.

Other Sources

Advertising Education. A report by A.A.A.A.; University of Illinois, June 9-12, 1971.

"Attitudes of College Students Toward Advertising and Advertising Careers." The A.A.A.A. Michigan Council Survey presented to A.A.A.A. Nov. 1, 1962.

"Bewitched." Screen Gems Production (television), 1960's